Honorable Thomas S. Zilly

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24

25

26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

VENICE PI, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

GREGORY SCOTT;
JOSHUA LONGLEY;
DAMON DICKINSON;
MICHAEL SMITH;
SCOTT STEELE;
MEGAN DEVILLERS;
DONAVAN JOSEPH; and
DEREK PERRY,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 17-cv-1075TSZ

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL OF DEFENDANTS

In "John Doe" copyright cases of the present type, this Court has previously required a plaintiff to name a defendant once the account name for the IP address is known, stating that the plaintiff can seek leave to amend later if discovery shows it to be necessary. *E.g., Cobbler v. James*, Case No. 15-cv-1430TSZ (January 26, 2016, Dkt. 16); *see also Dallas Buyers Club v. Does*, Case No. 15-cv-134RAJ (and others) (Dkt. 48). Requests to conduct more particularized discovery before naming a defendant have been denied. At the time this action was filed, Plaintiff proceeded in this fashion, with the understanding that the complaint satisfied all pleading requirements.

LOWE GRAHAM JONES ...

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800 Seattle, Washington 98104 206.381.3300 • F: 206.381.3301

22

After this action was filed, the Court issued an order precluding Plaintiff from conducting any discovery while also ordering Plaintiff to provide an offer of proof with respect to several assertions in the case. (E.g., Dkts. 31, 39, 53) Plaintiff responded to this order, and others, and sought leave to resume the proceedings. (E.g., Dkts. 35, 40, 51, 54). Since the time this action was filed, Plaintiff has not been allowed to conduct discovery beyond the service of a subpoena to secure the name of the ISP account holder.

More than a year after the present complaint was filed, the Ninth Circuit issued a decision which this Court describes as requiring the pleading in the complaint of "something more" to tie the account holder to the infringing conduct. Cobbler Nevada, LLC v. Gonzales, 901 F.3d 1142 (9th Cir. 2018). Plaintiff has not been afforded any opportunity to timely conduct discovery into such matters, and believes that in cases of this type a plaintiff should be allowed to gather facts using Court-sanctioned discovery while it is still ripe. In this case, however, given the passage of more than two years since the filing of the complaint, Plaintiff believes any meaningful opportunities to obtain such discovery are now lost.

Mindful of the foregoing and in an effort to conserve judicial and party resources, pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i), Plaintiff hereby dismisses its claims against Defendants Scott, Longley, Dickinson, Smith, Joseph and Perry without prejudice.

> s/ David A. Lowe, WSBA No. 24,453 Lowe@LoweGrahamJones.com LOWE GRAHAM JONES PLLC 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800 Seattle, WA 98104 T: 206.381.3300

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Seattle, Washington 98104

206.381.3300 • F: 206.381.3301